

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Katherine Dee Fletcher,

Plaintiff

v.

Gov. Entities,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00577-JAD-BNW

**Order Denying Motion to Route Notice of  
Appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court and  
Dismissing Unauthorized Direct Appeal**

[ECF No. 33]

This case was dismissed and closed based on Plaintiff Katherine Dee Fletcher’s motion for voluntary dismissal.<sup>1</sup> Fletcher filed a notice of appeal “to the USCA,”<sup>2</sup> and the clerk of this court forwarded that notice to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which opened an appeal for her.<sup>3</sup> In a second notice of appeal, Fletcher states that she “further appeals to the United States Supreme Court,”<sup>4</sup> and she moves this court to “route” her appeal to the High Court.<sup>5</sup>

Rule 18.1 of the Rules of the United States Supreme Court allows a notice of appeal to the United States Supreme Court to be filed in, and processed by, the district court “[w]hen a direct appeal from a decision of a United States district court is authorized by law.”<sup>6</sup> The rule also requires the appellant to “specify the statute or statutes under which the appeal is taken.”<sup>7</sup>

Fletcher does not specify the authority that permits her to skip the appellate court and

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF Nos. 25, 26.

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 28

<sup>3</sup> ECF No. 29.

<sup>4</sup> ECF No. 32.

<sup>5</sup> ECF No. 33.

<sup>6</sup> S.C.R. 18.1.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

1 take her appeal of this court’s decision to grant her motion to voluntarily dismiss her 42 U.S.C.  
2 § 1983 case straight to the United States Supreme Court. Only a small handful of matters get  
3 that privilege—like challenges to injunctive-relief orders issued by three-judge panels<sup>8</sup>—and  
4 Fletcher hasn’t shown that her case qualifies. Just as a court may dismiss a cause of action when  
5 the claim is “so insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed by prior decisions of this Court, or  
6 otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy,”<sup>9</sup> so too ought this  
7 court reject a notice of direct appeal to the United States Supreme Court when the law does not  
8 permit it.

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **plaintiff’s notice of appeal to the United States**  
10 **Supreme Court [ECF No. 32] is DISMISSED**, and her motion to route the appeal to the High  
11 Court **[ECF No. 33] is DENIED**.

12 Dated: August 22, 2024

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 <sup>8</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

<sup>9</sup> *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t*, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998).